

March 1, 2006

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF
THE TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Torrance Planning Commission convened in a regular session at 7:05 p.m. on Wednesday, March 1, 2005, in City Council Chambers at Torrance City Hall.

2. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Drevno.

3. ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Browning, Busch, Drevno, Faulk, Gibson, Horwich, and Chairperson Uchima.

Absent: None.

Also Present: Sr. Planning Associate Lodan, Planning Assistant Naughton, Deputy City Attorney Whitham, Fire Marshal Kazandjian, Building Regulations Administrator Segovia, and Associate Civil Engineer Symons.

4. POSTING OF THE AGENDA

MOTION: Commissioner Horwich, seconded by Commissioner Faulk, moved to accept and file the report of the secretary on the posting of the agenda for this meeting; voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – January 18, 2006

MOTION: Commissioner Horwich moved for the approval of the January 18, 2006 Planning Commission minutes as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Browning and passed by unanimous roll call vote.

6. REQUESTS FOR POSTPONEMENT

Sr. Planning Associate Lodan relayed a request to continue Agenda Item 8B (PRE05-00043: Nelu Ardeljan) to April 19, 2006.

MOTION: Commissioner Horwich, seconded by Commissioner Faulk, moved to continue Agenda Item 8A to April 19, 2006; voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

Chairperson Uchima announced that the hearing would not be re-advertised because it was continued to a date certain.

Chairperson Uchima reviewed the policies and procedures of the Planning Commission, including the right to appeal decisions to the City Council.

7. TIME EXTENSIONS

7A. MIS06-00046 (TTM54196): COURTYARD VILLA ESTATES

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a one-year time extension of a previously approved Tentative Tract Map (TTM54916) for condominium purposes and to allow a Lot Line Adjustment on property located in the C-2 Zone at 3914 and 4004 Sepulveda Boulevard and 22311 Ocean Avenue.

As no representative was present, this item was deferred until later in the meeting, see page 13.

8. CONTINUED HEARINGS

8A. PRE05-00023, WAV05-00013: LES ARNESON

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Precise Plan of Development to allow the construction of first and second-story additions to an existing one-story, single-family residence and a Waiver of the required side and front-facing garage setback requirements on property located in the Hillside Overlay District in the R-1 Zone at 207 Via Anita.

Recommendation

Approval.

Planning Assistant Naughton introduced the request.

Chairperson Uchima announced that he was abstaining from consideration of this item because he lives within the notification area and exited Council Chambers.

(Commissioner Faulk chaired this portion of the meeting.)

Les Arneson, applicant, voiced his agreement with the recommended conditions of approval.

MOTION: Commissioner Horwich, seconded by Commissioner Busch, moved to close the public hearing; voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

MOTION: Commissioner Horwich moved for the approval of PRE05-00023 and WAV05-00013, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Busch and passed by unanimous roll call vote, with Chairperson Uchima abstaining.

Planning Assistant Naughton read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 05-116 and 05-117.

MOTION: Commissioner Horwich moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 05-116 and 05-117. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Busch and passed by unanimous roll call vote, with Chairperson Uchima abstaining.

Chairperson Uchima returned to the dais.

8B. PRE05-00043: NELU ARDELJAN

Planning Commission consideration of a Precise Plan of Development to allow the construction of a new two-story, single-family residence with an attached garage on property located in the Hillside Overlay District in the R-1 Zone at 227 Paseo de Granada.

Continued to April 19, 2006.

9. WAIVERS – None.

10. FORMAL HEARINGS

10A. CUP06-00001, DIV06-00001: SHEIKH ULHAQ (KAMRAN NADIR)

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow the construction of two detached condominiums in conjunction with a request for a Division of Lot for condominium purposes on property located in the R-2 Zone at 18144 Regina Avenue.

Recommendation

Approval.

Planning Assistant Naughton introduced the request.

Kamran Nadir, project architect, voiced his agreement with the recommended conditions of approval.

Jason Hyde, representing his parents who live at 18138 Regina Avenue, stated that his parents support the proposed project but would like the north-facing second story windows of the back unit to be frosted or raised above eye level because these windows would overlook a garden retreat and Jacuzzi that they use on a daily basis.

Commissioner Faulk asked if the applicant was amenable to raising the sill height of the windows or frosting the lower half. Mr. Nadir voiced his opinion that changing the windows would detract from the project's appearance because the windows would not be consistent with the rest of the house and noted that the Jacuzzi is covered by a canopy so privacy should not be an issue.

Mr. Hyde stated that while it's true the Jacuzzi is under a canopy, the rest of the garden is not, so his parents' privacy would still be impacted.

Commissioner Faulk expressed his preference to continue the hearing to allow Commissioners an opportunity to visit the site to determine if privacy is an issue.

A brief discussion ensued, and Commissioners indicated that they were inclined to either approve the project with a condition requiring the windows to be raised or frosted, or continuing the hearing to March 15.

After consulting with his client, Mr. Nadir proposed reducing the size of the windows in question from 4 feet to 3 feet and indicated that he would agree to continue the hearing if that was the Commission's preference.

MOTION: Commissioner Faulk moved to continue the hearing to March 15, 2006. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gibson, and discussion continued.

Commissioner Horwich stated that he was prepared to vote on the project this evening because he didn't believe the impact was significant enough to the delay the project and felt little would be gained by visiting the site because of the difficulty of determining what the view will be from windows that don't exist yet.

Commissioner Browning noted his agreement with Commissioner Horwich's remarks.

In response to Commissioner Busch's inquiry, Deputy City Attorney Whitham confirmed that the Commission could consider the project's impact on privacy even though it is not covered by the Hillside Overlay Ordinance, which contains specific protections for privacy. She explained that Commissioners have the authority to impose any conditions they believe are necessary and reasonable to mitigate project-related adverse impacts because the project requires a Conditional Use Permit.

Commissioner Faulk withdrew his motion.

MOTION: Commissioner Horwich moved for the approval of CUP06-00001 and DIV06-00001, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff, with the following modifications:

Add

- That north-facing second-story windows of the rear unit shall be decreased in size from 4 feet to 3 feet, or the lower portion shall be opaque to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Busch and passed by unanimous roll call vote, with Commissioner Faulk abstaining.

Planning Assistant Naughton read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 06-031 and 06-032.

MOTION: Commissioner Busch moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 06-031 and 06-032 as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gibson and passed by unanimous roll call vote, with Commissioner Faulk abstaining.

10B. CUP06-00002, DIV06-00002: ROBERT AND PAMELA AGUILAR

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow the construction of two detached condominiums in conjunction with a request for a Division of Lot for condominium purposes on property located in the R-2 Zone at 1641 Juniper Avenue.

Recommendation

Approval.

Planning Assistant Naughton introduced the request and noted supplemental material available at the meeting consisting of three additional conditions of approval.

Rosa Velazquez, project designer, voiced her agreement with the recommended conditions of approval, with the exception of Condition No. 12, requiring the applicant to upgrade the overhead-serviced street lighting and utility system to an underground-fed street light and utility system, complete with Marbelite pole. She stated that the applicants have no objection to undergrounding their utilities but are concerned about the cost of changing out the existing power pole and explained that they intend to get a quote from Edison and would like to request that this requirement be waived if it turns out to be extremely high.

Associate Civil Engineer Symons advised that if the estimate from Edison is disproportionately high, as compared to the cost of the project, staff would waive this requirement. He noted that it is a City Council directive that the undergrounding of utilities be required when new projects are brought forward.

In response to questions from the Commission, staff provided clarification regarding conditions of approval in the supplemental material.

Pamela Aguilar, applicant, noted that her in-laws live on the subject property and she and her husband split their time between here and Northern California. She explained that the house is too small to accommodate everyone now that they have a child, therefore, they would like to build two units so they each will have their own space. She stated that she completely understands the City's desire to get rid of unsightly power poles, however, it has been her experience as a former employee of an electric company, that switching out a pole can be extremely expensive and this added expense could devastate their budget for the project.

In response to Chairperson Uchima's inquiry, Ms. Aguilar estimated that changing the pole could cost between \$50,000 to \$100,000.

Chairperson Uchima asked what staff would consider reasonable. Associate Civil Engineer Symons stated that he believed 5% of the value of the project would be reasonable, that 20% would not be reasonable, and anything between those two figures would be left to the discretion of the Community Development Director.

Commissioner Faulk related his understanding that the emphasis of the City Council's directive was on commercial developments and large residential projects. He stated that he did not believe the Council's intention was to burden two-unit condominium projects with this expense and favored waiving this requirement.

Commissioner Horwich noted that this issue came up recently in conjunction with the remodeling of a church and the Commission elected to let the Community Development Director decide whether or not to waive this requirement after reviewing the cost estimate.

A brief discussion ensued, and Commissioners debated whether to eliminate the requirement or to leave it to the discretion of the Community Development Director.

Chairperson Uchima agreed with Commissioner Faulk that the Council's directive was not intended to penalize individual property owners trying to improve their own property. While recognizing the City's interest in beautification, he voiced his opinion that even 5% of the value of the project, which would amount to \$20,000 in this case, was too much of a burden. He noted that there are other power poles on this street, so changing one would not result in a significant improvement in terms of aesthetics.

MOTION: Commissioner Horwich, seconded by Commissioner Drevno, moved to close the public hearing; voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

In response to Commissioner Busch's inquiry, Associate Civil Engineer Symons confirmed that this requirement has been waived in the past when the cost was determined to be disproportionate to the value of the project.

Commissioner Busch voiced his opinion that this issue was better left to staff rather than making individual exceptions at Planning Commission meetings.

Commissioner Drevno noted her agreement with Commissioner Busch's remarks.

MOTION: Commissioner Busch moved for the approval of CUP05-00002 and DIV06-00002, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gibson and passed by a 5-2 roll call vote, with Commissioner Faulk and Chairperson Uchima dissenting.

Planning Assistant Naughton read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 06-033 and 06-034.

MOTION: Commissioner Drevno moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 06-033 and 06-034. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Horwich and passed by a 5-2 roll call vote, with Commissioner Faulk and Chairperson Uchima dissenting.

10C. MOD06-00001 (PCR76-17): VON'S – A SAFEWAY COMPANY

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Modification of a previously approved Planning Commission Review (PCR76-17) to allow the construction of a replacement grocery store including an approximately 12,000 square-foot expansion, parking lot improvements adding an existing vacant parcel, and façade improvements for the entire shopping center on property located in the C-3 Zone at 4705 Torrance Boulevard.

Recommendation

Approval.

Planning Assistant Naughton introduced the request and noted additional material available at the meeting consisting of a revised condition of approval.

Craig Babb, project architect, reported that a remodeling project was approved some time ago, but the applicant has decided to build a new grocery store instead of remodeling it. He expressed concerns about Condition No. 3, which requires that all new uses for the northerly shops to be consistent with the retail parking requirement of one parking space for each 200 square feet of floor area. He explained that the site is under-parked and existing floor space would have to be eliminated in order to comply with this requirement.

Commissioner Horwich related his understanding that the condition was intended to prevent any worsening of the parking situation by prohibiting uses, such as restaurants, which require a higher parking ratio.

Sr. Planning Associate Lodan confirmed that this was the intent of the condition, and Mr. Babb voiced his agreement with the conditions of approval.

Chairperson Uchima commented positively on the project, stating that he believed it would be a great improvement for this shopping center.

MOTION: Commissioner Horwich, seconded by Commissioner Faulk, moved to close the public hearing; voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

Commissioner Busch voiced support for the project and expressed appreciation for Von's show of commitment to the city of Torrance.

Commissioner Faulk commented positively on the project and commended staff for not overlooking the need for landscaping and requiring irrigated sod parkways.

Commissioner Horwich noted that the project will be a vast improvement for this neglected corner and questioned how long the area would be without a market.

Mike Alba, representing Von's, reported that the project will take six to nine months.

MOTION: Commissioner Busch moved for the approval of MOD06-00001, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gibson and passed by unanimous roll call vote.

Planning Assistant Naughton read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 06-035.

MOTION: Commissioner Drevno moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution No. 06-035. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Horwich and passed by unanimous call vote.

*

The Commission recessed from 8:30 p.m. to 8:42 p.m.

11. **RESOLUTIONS** - None.

12. **PUBLIC WORKSHOP ITEMS** – None.

13. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

13A. MIS06-00021: MARGARET MILLER

Planning Commission review of an appeal of a Community Development Director approval of a Minor Hillside Exemption to allow a four-foot fence along the western property line in the front yard on property located within the Hillside Overlay District in the R-1 Zone at 5364 Doris Way.

Recommendation

Approval.

Planning Assistant Naughton introduced the request.

Commissioner Drevno announced that she was abstaining from consideration of this item because Karen Williams, the daughter of the appellants, sent a letter questioning her ability to be fair and impartial after observing her interaction with the appellants and the applicant during a site visit. She stated that although Ms. Williams' interpretation of what she observed was incorrect, she felt it was best to abstain.

Commissioner Busch stated that he believed Ms. Drevno's actions in viewing the property were entirely appropriate and that he saw no reason for her to abstain from this item, but would respect her decision to do so.

Commissioner Horwich stated that he also would respect Ms. Drevno's decision to excuse herself from this hearing, but wanted it known that he had complete faith in her integrity and did not believe it was necessary.

Marge Miller, 5364 Doris Way, applicant, reported that she has made many improvements to the front of her property and the proposed fence will complete the project. She voiced her agreement with the recommended conditions of approval.

James Williams, 5372 Doris Way, voiced his opposition to the proposed fence, contending that it would violate TMC Section 91.41.6 (a), (b), (c) and (d). Submitting documents to illustrate, he maintained that the fence would block his view, shadow his plants, create a traffic hazard, and restrict natural airflow thereby forcing whirlwinds of contaminated air onto his property. He expressed concerns that the fence would interfere with his view of traffic when backing out of the driveway with his boat. He noted that the documents submitted include an explanation of the "Reynolds effect," a phenomenon that occurs when airflow is restricted creating high-speed swirling winds that spread pollutants. He reported that his wife has an asthmatic condition, which makes airborne pollutants a major concern. He suggested that the fence is a "spite fence," as it would serve no purpose and would not even match the fence on the other side of the property. He stated that he and his neighbor used to have a cordial relationship, but they have been at odds for the past few years and the City has offered to provide free arbitration, but Ms. Miller declined.

Commissioner Browning questioned whether winds of the velocity necessary to trigger the Reynolds effect commonly occur in the Riviera area. Mr. Williams reported that he has experienced winds of 50-60 miles an hour in his neighborhood; conceded

that westerly winds are more prevalent, in which case debris from his yard blows into Ms. Miller's yard; and estimated that the wind blows in the opposite direction approximately 35% of the time.

Commissioner Busch questioned whether Mr. Williams was concerned about the height of the fence or was opposed to any fence. Mr. Williams indicated that he was opposed to any fence or even a hedge at this location.

In response to Commissioner Busch's inquiry, Sr. Planning Associate Lodan advised that no permit would be required for the planting of a hedge.

June Lee, 5245 Vanderhill Road, urged approval of the project. She reported that she built a fence similar to the one proposed for safety reasons because her neighbor has a stair-stepped block wall like Mr. Williams' wall, which children were using as a balance beam. She disputed the idea that the fence would be a safety hazard for vehicles backing out of the driveway.

Brenda Short, 5359 Bindewald Road, voiced support for the project, maintaining that it would improve safety, create a more balanced look for the property, and provide more privacy for the Williams. She doubted that the fence would have any impact on the Williams' view because they usually have a van parked in the driveway that obstructs the view in this direction.

Monika Weidemann, 5356 Doris Way, stated that she appreciates the improvements Ms. Miller has made to her property and that she supports the proposed fence and believes it will benefit both parties by giving them more privacy.

Pam Martel, 5265 Zakon Road, stated that she also appreciates the improvements Ms. Miller has made, particularly the addition of a sidewalk. She stressed the safety aspect of the fence, noting that her neighbor was required to put a fence on top of a retaining wall for safety reasons.

In response to Chairperson Uchima's inquiry, Building Regulations Administrator Segovia advised that the Code requires that some type of guardrail be placed on a retaining wall if there is a 30-inch or greater difference in elevation.

Karen Miller, 5364 Doris Way, responded to Mr. Williams' comments. Submitting photographs to illustrate, she explained that boat trailers in Mr. Williams' yard are arranged in such a way that he can back into the driveway, attach the trailer, and then pull out facing forward onto Doris Way, therefore the fence would not be a safety hazard. She reported that Mr. Williams often uses a blower to clean his driveway, which is not the action of someone who is concerned about airborne contaminants. With regard to view impact, she noted that Mr. Williams' primary view is to the north and the west and that there is usually a van parked in the driveway blocking the view in question.

Returning to the podium, Marge Miller explained that she would like to build the fence because Mr. Williams works on cars in his driveway and this is something she would prefer not to see.

Commissioner Horwich questioned why Ms. Miller was proposing a wood fence, rather than something more in keeping with masonry improvements in her front yard,

and Ms. Miller explained that the fence would match the existing fence on that side of the house.

MOTION: Commissioner Faulk, seconded by Commissioner Horwich, moved to close the public hearing; voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

Commissioner Faulk indicated that he would support the proposed fence as conditioned and expressed disappointment that the two parties were not able to resolve this matter on their own. He stated that the study submitted by Mr. Williams on the Reynolds effect was quite technical, however, he did notice that it referred to fertilizers and contaminants used in an agricultural setting and doubted that the proposed fence would have any effect on the spread of airborne pollutants. He further stated that he did not believe that the fence would have a significant impact on Mr. Williams' view because his house is oriented to take advantage of the view in the opposite direction. He noted that safety issues were addressed by the condition requiring the fence to be cut back by three feet (Condition No. 4) to preserve an adequate line-of-sight.

MOTION: Commissioner Faulk moved for the approval of MIS06-00021, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Browning and passed by unanimous roll call vote, with Commissioner Drevno abstaining.

Commenting on his vote, Commissioner Horwich stated that he was in no position to judge the validity of the material presented on the Reynolds effect and while he empathizes with someone who suffers from bronchial problems, he was not convinced that the proposed fence would do anything to exacerbate them.

Planning Assistant Naughton read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 06-030.

MOTION: Commissioner Bush moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution No. 06-030. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Browning and passed by unanimous call vote, with Commissioner Drevno abstaining.

Commissioner Drevno returned to the dais.

13B. MIS06-00037: CORNELIUS BOR

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Minor Hillside Exemption to allow a 492 square-foot, one-story addition to an existing single-story residence located in the R-1 Zone at 407 Via Mesa Grande.

Recommendation

Approval.

Chairperson Uchima announced that he was abstaining from consideration of this item because he lives within the notification area and exited the dais.

(Commissioner Faulk chaired this portion of the meeting.)

Planning Assistant Naughton introduced the request.

Cornelius Bor, 407 Via Mesa Grande, voiced his agreement with the recommended conditions of approval. He stated that he has lived at this address for 22 years and would like to upgrade the interior and exterior of his outdated house and add 492 square feet of living space. He reported that he has tried very hard to address his neighbors' concerns about the project, and regrets that they have not been able to come to an agreement. He explained that the modest-sized addition would result in an FAR of .22, which is far below the maximum permitted; maintained that the project would enhance the neighborhood and have only minimal impact of views; and requested approval of the project as submitted. He stated that contrary to the letter from the owners of 410 Via Mesa Grande, he has never been confrontational during discussions of the project with neighbors.

Michael Gialketsis, representing his parents, Bruce and Janet Traverse, 410 Via Mesa Grande, reported that 2 out of 5 of immediate neighbors oppose the project. He stated that the findings that must be made according to TMC Section 91.41.6 have not been substantiated, contending that the project would have an adverse impact of the view, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity; that the development has not been planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on neighboring properties; that the project will have a harmful impact on property values in the vicinity due to loss of view; that denial of the application would not result in unreasonable hardship to the applicant because they currently enjoy a wonderful view; and that granting of the application would be detrimental to other properties in the vicinity. He maintained that the magnitude of impact was irrelevant because the Code does not specify a certain degree of impact. He proposed that the addition be relocated to the front of the house where it would not impact the view of neighbors and reduced in size.

Mr. Gialketsis stated that the Commission had the following options: 1) Deny the project; 2) Require that it be redesigned so it does not affect views; or 3) Require conditions that compensate those who are impacted, i.e., require the granting of a view easement. He called for the Commission to revise the Code to clearly define the term "adverse impact."

Deputy City Attorney Whitham clarified that the provision requiring that a finding be made that denial of the application would constitute an unreasonable hardship for the applicant was deleted from TMC Section 91.41.6 approximately five years ago.

Mr. Gialketsis reported that he downloaded the Code section from the City's website, and Deputy City Attorney Whitham indicated that she would check with City staff to see why this information was incorrectly posted.

Leonard Frederick, project architect, reported that he has been working on this project for over a year and designed it with a very low profile to avoid impacting neighbors.

Janet Traverse, 410 Via Mesa Grande, stated that her ocean view has diminished over the past 34 years due to the growth of trees and that she and her husband would like to enjoy the remaining view without any further encroachment.

Spencer Durhan, 420 Via Mesa Grande, reported that he is opposed to the project because of the impact on his view and submitted photographs to illustrate.

MOTION: Commissioner Busch, seconded by Commissioner Browning, moved to close the public hearing; voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

Voicing support for the project, Commissioner Browning reported that he visited the site and observed no view impact from either of the properties that submitted letters of objection – 406 and 410 Via Mesa Grande – and had to look very hard to even see the silhouette. He complimented the architect on the well-designed project, noting its modest size.

For the benefit of the audience, Commissioner Busch explained that the Hillside Ordinance does not address trees, therefore, the Commission has no authority to regulate them. He stated that he also observed no blockage of views and would support the project as submitted.

Voicing support for the project, Commissioner Drevno reported that she observed no view impact at 410 Via Mesa Grande and very minimal impact at 406 Via Mesa Grande, which appears to have a great view from a second story.

MOTION: Commissioner Busch moved for the approval of MIS06-00037, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Browning and passed by unanimous roll call vote, with Chairperson Uchima abstaining.

Planning Assistant Naughton read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 06-036.

MOTION: Commissioner Drevno moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution No. 06-036. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Horwich and passed by unanimous call vote, with Chairperson Uchima abstaining.

Chairperson Uchima returned to the dais.

13C. PLANNING COMMISSION ANNUAL REPORT

Sr. Planning Associate Lodan noted that a draft of the 2005 Planning Commission Annual Report was included in the agenda material.

Commissioner Horwich thanked staff for preparing the detailed report and offered one correction to the Summary of Annual Activities.

MOTION: Commissioner Horwich moved to approve the 2005 Planning Commission Annual Report as amended and to forward it to the City Council. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Busch and passed by unanimous roll call vote.

Agenda Item 7A was considered at this time.

7A. MIS06-00046 (TTM54196) – COURTYARD VILLA ESTATES

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a one-year time extension of a previously approved Tentative Tract Map (TTM54916) for condominium purposes and to allow a Lot Line Adjustment on property located in the C-2 Zone at 3914 and 4004 Sepulveda Boulevard and 22311 Ocean Avenue.

MOTION: Commissioner Horwich moved for the approval of MIS06-00046, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Drevno and passed by unanimous roll call vote.

Planning Assistant Naughton read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-071.

MOTION: Commissioner Busch moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-071. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Horwich and passed by unanimous call vote.

14. REVIEW OF CITY COUNCIL ACTION ON PLANNING MATTERS

Sr. Planning Associate Lodan reviewed recent City Council action on Planning matters, noting that a Resolution was presented to Jane Isomoto at the February 28, 2006 City Council meeting honoring her for 42 years of dedicated service to the City.

15. LIST OF TENTATIVE PLANNING COMMISSION CASES

Sr. Planning Associate Lodan reviewed the agenda for the March 15, 2006 Planning Commission meeting.

16. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

16A. Don Barnard, Save Historical Old Torrance, reported on SHOT's 2nd Annual Extravaganza held at the Depot restaurant the previous Sunday and expressed the hope that Commissioners would attend next year's event.

16B. Chairperson Uchima invited Commissioners to attend Jane Isomoto's retirement party to be held, Thursday, March 2, 2006, from 3:00 to 6:00 p.m. in the meeting room at the Katy Geissert Civic Center Library. He noted that Commissioner Horwich had agreed to represent the Commission and thanked him for doing so.

16C. Commissioner Drevno requested an excused absence from the March 8 General Plan Workshop because her twin granddaughters were being recognized as "Students of the Month."

Chairperson Uchima, seconded by Commissioner Faulk, so moved; voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

16D. Sr. Planning Associate Lodan reviewed the agenda for the March 8 General Plan Workshop.

17. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:25 p.m., the meeting was adjourned to Wednesday, March 8, 2006, for a General Plan Workshop.

Approved as Submitted May 3, 2005 s/ Sue Herbers, City Clerk
--